



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

(PA, Fr. 2), ἀντικρυς (PA 26), εἶωθα (PE 50), ἑκάτερος (Agr. 2), ἐνθα (PE 56), ἐξάλλουαι (Naass Ev. 6), ἐφοράω (PA 25), μῖασμα (PA 24), οἰκήτωρ (PA 17 and 19), παροργισμός (Agr. 30 *bis*), στήθος (PE 28), τημελοῦχος (PA, Fr. 3). More than one occurrence of a word in the same context is not indicated, e.g., γαμέω, Agr. 18 (four times); and ἰχώρ, PA 26 *bis*, marked (†). Moreover, a casual reading shows about a hundred instances where an asterisk has been used in the lexicon and the usage of the apocrypha left unrecorded. Sometimes this reference would have been a fortunate illustration, as μονή, PA, Fr. 3 beside John 14:2, 23; at other times it would have called for further definition, as ἀνατρέχω, PA, Fr. 2 (add *hinlaufen*) and ἐξάλλουαι, Naass Ev 6 (add *hervorspringen*).

It would be very unfair to convey the impression that this lexicon lacks genuine merit. Notwithstanding the numerous minor defects, which it is to be hoped may early be corrected by a new edition, the author has placed students of this literature under great obligation to him. His main interest has been in the specific body of literature before him, not in the Greek language as a whole and in these writings as historically related to the whole, consequently his lexicon will not meet all the needs of the specialist. But in fairness to the author it should be remembered that he aimed to produce a book suitable for more general use; and in this respect he has rendered excellent service.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Dr. Scott's book on the Pauline epistles<sup>1</sup> is pleasant to read but impossible to accept. The author's object is "not speculation," but to determine from a critical study of "internal data, mainly theological ideas and literary style," the authorship of fifteen New Testament epistles. To all this there can be no objection. One may perhaps agree in part with the author also when he says that "the requirement of the critic of the epistles or gospels is not imagination loaded with extensive learning, but sure vision cognizant of truth and sensitive to difference." However, this word about "sure vision" sounds rather ominous, for, naturally, as the author considers this the chief requirement of the critic and as he gives us a critical volume on the New Testament epistles, we must suppose that he, by implication, claims to have the "sure vision cognizant of truth and sensitive to difference." A "sure vision" would indeed be a most excellent outfit, but since this

<sup>1</sup>*The Pauline Epistles: A Critical Study.* By Robert Scott. Edinburgh: Clark, 1909. 376 pages. \$2.

gift has never yet been certainly found among critics, a word may be said for the value of enlightened judgment and general knowledge both of the documents and of what other investigators have accomplished.

The Preface whets the reader's interest by saying that the chief value of the volume may perhaps be found, not in the settlement of the authorship of the New Testament epistles, but in the light it may throw on the authorship of the First Gospel and on the mind of the writer of the third.

Now although the author eschews "speculation," his book seems to me to be speculative in an unusually high degree. Let a few points be noted. It is said (p. 60) that Paul, after his conversion, "retired into Arabia, re-studied the Scriptures, re-interpreted history and the ways of God and purposes of grace." This may be a *probable* conjecture, but a conjecture it surely is. Again, the process by which Ephesians and Hebrews and I Peter are assigned to Silas is thoroughly conjectural. Grant that Ephesians was not written by Paul and that it *might* have been composed by Silas; it is nevertheless at the outset a matter of pure conjecture that Silas composed it. We must obviously judge in the same manner of the view that assigns Colossians to Timothy and the Pastoral Epistles to Luke. Whatever may be said of the various arguments by which the author seeks to support the hypothesis that Silas, Timothy, and Luke were the authors of certain important letters, it is clear that he begins with bold conjecture. This is not necessarily wrong, but if one's work rests on conjecture, it may be well to acknowledge it, or at least not to affirm the opposite.

For a book that deals with questions of authorship which are to be settled by differences of doctrine, often scarcely apparent to the ordinary reader, and by nice stylistic inequalities, it may be said that this discussion is too positive in its conclusions. Thus we are said to have "conclusive" proof that the author of I Peter and Ephesians depended on II Corinthians in the resemblance that they reveal to the opening words of II Corinthians and its use of ἀρχαῖον. Again, we have the declaration (p. 96) that such a number of salutations as we have in Rom. 16 "could not have been dispatched to an unknown place." Thus summarily is the old question settled! Dr. Scott is not exactly in agreement with a good many other students of Paul when he affirms that "his doctrines are stated with an intellectual vigor which makes them clear to all except those who would wish them to be somewhat other." Dr. Hoennicke, e. g., whose book we have just noticed, does not think that Paul's doctrines are "clear to all," or that they ever were.

Take yet another illustration of this feature of the book before us. The author is speaking of I Thess. 2:15, 16, which reads as follows:

"Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men . . . the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." "Are these," he asks, "the words of the man who was ready to be accursed from Christ for the Jews' sake? Or could Paul have drawn the first two parallel lines; or any of these lines? The judgment that says so is judged." The tone of this statement reminds one again of that "sure vision cognizant of truth," to which reference was made above.

But we will not dwell on this point. The field of criticism chosen by the author is one in which it is rarely possible to be dogmatic without doing violence to the data.

Another point which is rather characteristic of the book is the license it exhibits in dealing with the synoptic tradition. Thus, e. g., the Beatitudes of poverty of spirit and of meekness seem to be assigned to Silas because of the similarity between them and Eph. 4:2. The reward promised to the pure in heart, that they shall see God, is attributed to the same source because of its resemblance to Heb. 12:12 (should be 11:27). The phrases "light of the world," "good works," and "glorify your Father" are said to "accord with the second group," that is, the group of letters assigned to Silas, and because of this accord they are given to him. In Matt. 13:17 there is reference to the forward look of men of old, and this, because of the reappearance of the same thought in I Pet. 1:10, 11 and Heb. 11:13 is classed with the evidence that the author of I Peter and Hebrews was the reviser of Matthew.

Now this method of dealing with the text of the words of Jesus seems altogether unjustifiable. The combination of lowliness and meekness in Eph. 4:2, instead of indicating that the author of Ephesians was the reviser of the Sermon on the Mount, may more easily be regarded as a simple echo of the Beatitudes. So should we judge in each of the other cases mentioned. The words of the Master colored the words of the disciple.

The argument of the book as a whole seems to me to be characterized by great subjectivity. Its results lack the quality of conclusiveness. It is bold and at times decidedly interesting, but the reader who looks up the references and compares the passages is left at last unconvinced. The objections that spring up at once to the view that Ephesians, Hebrews, and I Peter, together with the ecclesiastical and theological additions to Matthew, were the work of one man and that man a loyal disciple of Paul; to the view also that I Thess., chaps. 1-3, II Thess., chap. 3, and Colossians, with the final editorship of Mark's gospel, are to be credited to Timothy;

and to the view that the Pastoral Epistles with "many terms and some clauses in all Paul's epistles" are to be assigned to Luke, are not overcome by the reasons which are advanced in support of the hypothesis.

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

#### MODERN VIEWS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BIBLE

Two recent books dealing with the Bible are not so important as they are interesting.<sup>1</sup> They are both written by writers who have been on terms of intimacy with the Bible from childhood, though their personal attitude to the Bible is very different. To Professor Clarke it is the book which "still brings me the light and inspiration in which I work." To Mr. Picton Christianity itself and therefore the Bible also finds its value in the potency of its "influence in the age-long evolution from fetishism to Pantheism."

Mr. Picton writes in a discursive not to say excursive style. One involuntarily finds oneself wishing for the privilege of listening to him converse. It requires a good deal of determination to keep the thread of the argument. So far as the reviewer has been able to do so, he has found the author laying the gravamen of his work on these four points. First, the Bible played an abnormal part in the life of civilized man, particularly in the life of Protestants, in the latter part of the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth centuries. Second, during the preceding Christian centuries the reverence of men had been directed, perhaps more wisely, to the church. A discussion of this interesting point occupies about 125 pages. It is admitted that the great leaders of the church drew their inspiration from the Bible, but it exercised only a mediate influence upon the people and was not delivered into their ignorant and untutored possession. Third, the influence of the abnormal supremacy of the Bible, regarded as the infallible Word of God was neither wholly good nor wholly bad. It inculcated charity for all, veracity, liberty, freedom, the worth of the individual, but it fostered the vagaries—the author abstains from saying the dishonesty—of allegorical exegesis, unworthy ideas of God, the bad morals of justification by belief, the approval of compromise, the submission of reason to authority, the evils of introspection, and indifference to the progress of science. The apostle Paul looms large in the author's

<sup>1</sup> *Man and the Bible: A Review of the Place of the Bible in Human History.* By J. Allanson Picton, M.A. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1909. 334 pages.

*Sixty Years with the Bible: A Record of Experience.* By William Newton Clarke. New York: Scribner, 1909. 259 pages. \$1.25.